REMARKS

The application contains claims 1-6, 16-28 and 38-45. By this amendment, claims 1, 16, 24 and 38 have been amended. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 16, 24 and 38 have been amended to address the rejection noted in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Applicants therefore respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 16, 24 and 38 Define over Wright et al.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Wright et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,802,218). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection because *Wright et al.* does not teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 1.

Claim 1 recites:

> Apparatus for conducting a plurality of transactions related to dispensing postage, the apparatus comprising:
>
> a memory for storing accounting data concerning postage dispensation, the accounting data varying with the transactions; and
>
> **a plurality of identical processors, each processor being associated with a different subset of the transactions, wherein each processor is periodically engaged in a multiplexed manner to take turns verifying the accounting data for each transaction in the subset associated with the processor.**

Wright et al. does not disclose the use of a plurality of identical processors that are periodically engaged in a multiplexed manner to take turns verifying accounting data for each transaction in a subset of transactions associated with a particular processor. Instead, *Wright et al.* discloses a "card automated postal terminal" for conducting transactions involving a user microprocessor

7

card and the postal terminal (col. 3, line 18). Successive transactions are conducted with either the same user microprocessor card or another undeterminable user microprocessor card. As such, *Wright et al.* does not teach or suggest associating each processor with a different subset of transactions nor sequentially using each processor to conduct each transaction in a determinable, multiplexed manner. In contrast, an aspect of the present invention enables identical processors to be used in a set rotational manner to conduct transactions more efficiently (See pages 8-9 of the present application, lines 33-35 and 1-20, respectively). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn as *Wright et al.* fails to teach or suggest the use of identical processors that are periodically engaged in a multiplexed manner to take turns verifying accounting data for each transaction in a subset of transactions associated with a particular processor as recited in claim 1.

Claim 2-6 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons applicable to claim 1, as well as due to the features recited therein.

Independent claims 16, 24, and 38 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are therefore allowable over *Wright et al.* for at least those reasons mentioned above with respect to claim 1. Further, claims 17-23, 25-28 and 39-45 are allowable for at least those reasons stated above and based on their respective dependencies on independent claims 16, 24 and 38.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to Kenyon & Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4419 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

All claims are allowable. Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: __August 11, 2006__

Wesley W. Jones
Reg. No. 56,552

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 220-4200 telephone
(202) 220-4201 facsimile

623302_1.doc

9